Public Issues Exam Name: Joseph Stanford III Date: December 8, 2011

Campaigns/ Elections

Question 1) Give 7 specific examples of what you learned about political campaigns from volunteering? What are two strengths of the American political system? What is one weakness?

Answer:

I have learned about political campaigns from volunteering that these city councils were racing for winning. Only nine city councils can win the vote for city council. City Councils have many different ideas about hooking people to support one city council. Often time, city council make better adverting so people can vote for this. Sometimes, city councils make lies (hide their facts and say that I support this for them, but not for me). I remember that city council’s supporter asked me that “can you come here again someday?” because he said that I am very good at hooking to get people to vote for him. We did use yard sign up that drivers can see when they passed us. I think it’s easy to vote city councils if I have same information from city council. I should to research about these city councils before vote because I think it’s very important to me about these city councils.

American political system’s strength is that city councils need to make the facts with good hook so people can vote for this reason. Other strength is that city councils should to visit each places and speech to crowd about who they are and why they want to be city council for our community also what do they to protect for our community.

American political system’s weakness is that city council wear silly clothes or not talk about protect our community. For example, “We don’t support schools because of dumb education”. People will not vote for this reason.

First Amendment

Question 3) What does the First Amendment protect? What doesn’t it protect? Give examples from at least 2 Supreme Court cases with example of what the court ruled about the First Amendment? Give an example of when free speech should and should not be protected.

Answer:

Congress makes protected speech that is not inappropriate or offensive languages. Fighting words and offensive expressions should be placed on free speech for limitation.

Congress makes not protected speech that is talk about own religious or insult our country.

Supreme Court cases are involving the First Amendment. First case is Tinker. Tinker’s case is about school cannot prohibit an expression of opinion unless it has shown that expression has caused to cause substantial and material disruption to the school’s work or the rights of other students. The court rule not against Tinker because it’s part in free of speech.

Second Case is Hazlewood. Hazlewood’s case is about when speech is considered to bear the imprimatur of the school may be censored by the school so long as the school is acting in a reasonably related legitimate pedagogical concern. The court would rule this case for Imprimatur and Legitimate Pedagogical Concern.

Free speech should be speech for example, “I am Muslim and I hate America” because it’s part for free of speech and religious.

Free speech should not be speech for example, “Children must to say \*\*\*\* all the time” because it’s inappropriate languages for young people.

Street Law Exam

**Free Speech Scenario**

Question 1: You’ re the attorney for the protestor. What arguments would you make to defend the protestor from the charges?

Answer:

This protestor could not be charged by the police officer for inappropriate languages because it’s part in free of speech means this protestor can talk whenever they want. Police must not to charge protestor for inciting a riot because not only one protestor, they are more than one protestor in same place. This protestor can speak about riot or something because first amendment says, “Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech”.

Question 2: Assume you’re a prosecutor. What arguments would you make against the protestor?

Answer:

This protestor must be charged for against our law because police told them to vacate premises that are breaking the law. When police told them to vacate premises but this protestor ignore and insult is one that break the law because protestor didn’t obey police’s rules. If police follow strict law says, “ Police can arrest protestor for suing police”. Police did right way to do because police followed the law and didn’t break the law.

**Family Law Scenario**

Question 1: Pretend you are Cindy and Sally’s attorney

Answer:

My best legal arguments are that gay married or married are no different because they are humans. Ohio should not stop Cindy and Sally for gay married because they came from other state (Connecticut) not Ohio. Also Congress was proposed 11th amendment in Connecticut (1794). Ohio law should not make other state’s law.

Question 2: Pretend you are the defense attorney for the insurance company

Answer:

My best legal arguments are that gay married must not in our state because Ohio is our state law. Ohio’s insurance company can’t help gay married because it is not right for married couple. They must be recognized as married in Ohio because Ohio passed the law means it can’t change Ohio’s law.

**Criminal Law and Procedure Scenario**

Question #1: You are the Prosecutor in this case.

Answer:

Police officers don’t mean to break the law because they heard many screams in Dave’s house. Police allows to enter someone’s house because heard screams in the house maybe they need help. When police entered Dave’s house saw Dave and Sarah laid on the couch and noises from television not Dave or Sarah. But maybe police smell drugs in his house. Law allows police to search any drugs in house.

Question #2: You are Dave’s Defense Attorney in this case.

Answer:

Police officers have broken the law because fourth amendment says, “The right of the people against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrant shall issue.” Police must not to search without reasonable. Dave’s house is his own property means he can protect himself that no one can search his house. The law says that no one can allows to search or enter someone’s house without search warrant.